

REMARKS:

By the foregoing amendment, Applicant responds fully to the Office Action mailed January 23, 2006. Claims 1-6, 12, 13, 15-22, and 28-32 remain pending in the instant application. Claims 12 and 15 are amended by the present amendment. Claim 14
5 is cancelled by the present amendment.

Applicant notes the allowance of Claims 1-6, 17-22, and 28-32.

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sedita (FR 2,619,440), and under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sedita in view of Sato (US 6,474,011).

10 The Examiner states on page 4 of the Office Action that Claim 14 is objected to, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Rather than rewrite Claim 14 as an independent claim, Applicant has amended Claim 12 by the present amendment to include all of the limitations of Claim 14. Specifically, Claim 12 now also recites that the
15 top has an underside, and that the underside has a socket formed therein for receiving and substantially surrounding a ball for directly contacting the sear. Since the Examiner states that such a claim is allowable, it is believed that Claim 12, as amended, is allowable.

Claim 13 stands under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sedita in view of Sato. Claim 13 depends from Claim 12, which is now believed to be allowable. It is
20 therefore believed that Claim 13 is allowable as well.

Claim 14 has been cancelled by the present amendment, as the limitations of Claim 14 have been included in Claim 12.

Claims 15 and 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 15 has been amended to depend from Claim 12, which has all of the limitations of original Claim 14. Claim 16 depends on

5 Claim 15. Claim 12 is now believed to be allowable. Therefore, Claims 15 and 16 are now believed to be allowable as well. In the event that Claim 12, as amended, is not allowable, then Applicant will rewrite these claims in independent form to move the instant application towards issue.

In summary, Applicant responds fully to the Office Action dated January 23,

10 2006. Applicant believes that the present application containing claims 1-6, 12, 13, 15-22, and 28-32 is in condition for allowance. Favorable action to that end respectfully requested.

Signed at Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, this 30 day of January, 2006

15

Respectfully Submitted,



20 Nicholas A. Brannen
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 51,224

25 104 South Main Street, Suite 300
Fond du Lac, Wisconsin 54935
Telephone: 920-322-9130
Fax: 920-322-9131
nab@brannenlawoffice.com